

Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant  
(SPF SIG)

Draft Minutes for the  
Evaluation Workgroup Meeting  
DMHA Conference Room  
September 26<sup>th</sup>, 2006

**ATTENDEES:** Bob Levy, Jeff Barber, Sheila Nesbitt, Harold Kooreman, Rebecca Smith, Marcia French, John Viernes Jr., Gary Williams, and Lin Montgomery.

**WELCOME**

Bob Levy opened and welcomed all to the meeting.

**STAFFING REPORT:**

Discussion was had about the inclusion of Ruth Gassman, from the PRC, to the Workgroup. An email has been sent inviting her to serve and acknowledgment that she wasn't given enough time to schedule in for this meeting. The workgroup looks forward to her valuable input and joining with them at the next meeting.

**UPDATE REPORTS**

*SEOW Report*

The Epi-profile Report was distributed to members of the workgroup and reviewed briefly. Only 100 copies have been printed and a general consensus of what a wonderful job the Epi-group had done with the report was addressed. The full report is available to the public on the Urban Center's Web-site. Discussion of the importance of whom and how to disseminate this report will be deferred to the SAC.

*Evaluation Planning Documents*

Harold shared an evaluation document he had earlier put on the web-site for the workgroup members to review. Preference was agreed upon with regards to keeping the document focused on committees and workgroup rather than individuals. Specific areas of importance discussed to be evaluated included; fundamental understanding of the SPF and assessing the understanding on both a community and staff/quorum level, at what intervals assessments/evaluations should be given, modes of evaluations, and important content to be included in evaluations. It was agreed upon that the SAC meetings be evaluated on a quarterly basis and the committees/workgroups be evaluated on an annual basis with a comprehensive evaluation. Electronic evaluations were discussed and a consensus for written evaluations at the end of the meetings were agreed to be more targeted and efficient for a basic review and immediate feedback. The important role attendance plays was also targeted to understand whether members are understanding and building upon previous knowledge, or if they are confused due to not keeping abreast of the processes accomplished thus far. It was also noted to be of significance in establishing how often a quorum is present. A self-rating piece on whether members feel they are engaged on focusing for the best interest of the citizens of Indiana may also lead the most productive outcomes and should be included in the evaluation. Other areas of focus are whether the meeting has a clear agenda and objective, other topics or instruction they feel would be of value, most helpful or least helpful materials covered, and identifiable room for improvement.

In evaluating the responses we felt it important for the evaluations workgroup to review each evaluation and then to share with the Executive Committee and the governing officers of each of

the workgroups or committees being evaluated so they could in turn share the feedback with their committees.

#### *Draft of Strategic Work plan/Funding Distribution*

The draft of the Strategic Work plan was only received by a few of the members. The concerns voiced were the layout and need for clarifications on the allocations process.

#### *Data Collection Process*

It is anticipated that there will be a web-based data collection process to produce data for the NOMS and other reporting sources.

#### *Training and Outreach Set-up*

Within the next few weeks, Eric, Harold, Kim and Marcia will attend a conference on Evaluations. It will be necessary for the Epi-group to come up with cross-site criteria for evaluation, which the Evaluation Workgroup will review and offer suggestions on to address the fidelity and validity of the projects. It was agreed that to make the evaluation valid and to ensure fidelity all sites are to be evaluated on similar criteria building on the commonalities. To address this it will be imperative that fidelity is balanced with implementation and a close look is observed of the process and outcomes.

#### **Next Meeting Focuses:**

Review and make ready to present to the Executive Committee that afternoon, the document to be used in evaluating Committee and Workgroup meetings of the SPF SIG. Harold will send electronically a draft copy, implementing the suggestions made from today's meeting to the workgroup members to be reviewed. The members will review and send in their suggestions and comments and the final draft will be presented next month at the Evaluations Workgroup meeting. Upon approval it will be presented to the Executive Committee to review.

#### **MEETING SCHEDULE**

The next meeting will be October 24<sup>th</sup>, at 10:30 am.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair.